AS:mln

INV 5

MEMORANDUM

March 11, 1964

TO: Mr. J. Lee Rankin

FROM: Arlen Specter

SUBJECT: Witnesses Who Testified Before the Commission on March 9 and 10, 1964

On March 9, 1964, Roy H. Kellerman, William R. Greer, Clinton J. Hill, and Rufus W. Youngblood testified before the Commission. As you know, I interviewed these witnesses on March 3rd and 4th at which time they told me of the assassination events just as they were set forth in their statements previously provided to us by the Secret Service.

The testimony of the four Secret Service agents was similar to the information provided in their prior interviews. Mr. Kellerman added a significant element when he testified before the Commission that he believed there must have been more than three shots. I then developed fully all of the factors which led to that conclusion. Mr. Greer told me on March 3rd that he recollected only two shots, but testified that he heard three shots. All four witnesses impressed me as being credible. Mr. Kellerman tended to elaborate his answers with explanations of the various occurrences. Mr. Greer testified in an abbreviated fashion sticking close to what he knew first hand. Mr. Hill was an extremely articulate witness and had a thorough grasp of all the factors about which he testified. Mr. Youngblood also was quite articulate and poised in his testimony.

In my opinion all these witnesses did their very best to report the situation as they recollected it. Notwithstanding that, it is my conclusion that they do not accurately recall many of the details on the precise time or sequence of shots or their exact movements and reactions during the crucial 5 or 6 seconds.

Since the question had not been resolved as to the propriety of interviewing witnesses with or without a verbatim transcript in advance of their testimony, I did not interview Robert H. Jackson, Arnold Louis Rowland, James Robert Worrell or Amos Lee Euins in advance of their being called to testify before the Commission. In my view their testimony would have been somewhat better organized and more coherent with a pre-testimony interview, but all factors considered, their testimony went reasonably well.

Mr. Jackson was the oldest and most mature of this group and was a very credible witness. Trained as a photographer, it is my conclusion that substantial reliance can be placed upon his observations, especially in view of his spontaneous declaration at that time, corroborated by the other witnesses in the automobile with him. Mr. Jackson gave the impression of being confident of the factors he recollected and was, in general, an impressive witness.

Arnold Louis Rowland presented the picture of being a good-looking, bright, well-dressed young man. While he has the face of an 18-year old, he has the carriage and demeanor of an individual somewhat older. He gave the impression of being alert and intelligent, and he testified that he had straight As during most of his high school career and had an I.Q. of 147. At the conclusion of his testimony he broke down when Senator Cooper asked a well-intended question as to whether it occurred to Mr. Rowland to call to the attention of a nearby policeman the presence in the window of the man with the gun. Rowland answered that that was a recurring dream which he had which indicated his deep emotional involvement in the event.

There are many details of Rowland's testimony which cast significant doubt as to whether he could have observed and remembered as much. He testified that he had told the FBI on two occasions about the negro gentleman in the alleged assassination window which, of course, must be checked out. My impression was that the witness was telling the truth as he remembered it, but he had obviously thought about the subject on a great many occasions and has passed the assassination scene frequently which may provide the basis for his reconstruction of the event.

Congressman Ford did not notice that Rowland was starting to [illegible] spot and began to ask a line of questions which the Chief Justice interrupted. Congressman Ford asked me to ask the questions informally of Rowland which I did in the intervening recess, but they were not put on the record because Rowland did not return to the afternoon session. The Chief Justice very graciously sent Rowland on a tour of Washington with his chauffeur. Rowland told me that he passed by the assassination scene every day because it was on his way to work, but he had never gone back to the scene and stood there to try to recreate what he saw. I have drafted a brief memorandum to Congressman Ford on this subject which I am attaching to this memorandum for transmission to him if you approve.

James Richard Worrell was a very dull and inarticulate witness. He impressed me as being honest and straight forward, but not very alert. I do not place a great deal of reliance on his testimony and the position which he described he was in, when he looked up and saw the rifle, was a most awkward position. Worrell testified that he put his head straight back and looked up so that his eyes would have been looking straight upward in a line of extension of 180 degrees from his body. It is very possible that he did see the rifle but it is most likely that he turned in a somewhat different position if, in fact, he did see the rifle.

Amos Lee Euins was an inarticulate young negro boy (age 15) who, nevertheless, did a reasonably good job in relating what he saw. He impressed me as being credible and I evaluate his testimony as being believable. I concluded that it was not worthwhile to resolve the number of minor inconsistencies among his various statements and testimony.